



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,495	11/07/2006	Tadahiro Ohmi	039262-0163	3794
22428 7590 04/25/2011 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
EXAMINER ZERVIGON, RUDY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1716				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/25/2011		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/594,495		OHMI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Rudy Zervigon		1716	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Rudy Zervigon.

(2) Thomas G. Blodeau.

**Date of Interview:** 21 April 2011

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

None

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*The attendants discussed the Examiner's sole pending 112, 1st paragraph rejections. Regarding the 112 rejection under the "directing means coupled . . .", TB stated that gas ejection portions 37/34 is/are the components meeting the claimed features. The Examiner agreed to such an interpretation only under the condition that the qualifying "coupled to" clause is used in a general sense (as supported by Figure 26) and not in a literal sense where the directing means and the evaporation mechanism would be expected to have a common interfacing surface which is not supported by Applicant's Figure 26. Regarding the second 112 rejection, PH stated that the newly submitted Figure 41 shows Applicant's evaporation mechanism 135 as "part" of the container 125 and is not necessarily "outside said container" as claimed. RZ agreed with PH. TB stated that he would take the results of today's interview to Applicant along with suggestions on course(s) of action.*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

See attached advisory action

/Rudy Zervigon/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1716

**Status of Application:** After Final Rejection

(3) Parviz Hassanzadeh.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 10:00

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)